SINGLE BENCH

(1) 3

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR (C.G.)

WRIT PETITION NO. 1383 /2005

PETITIONER

Dheeraj Das Manikpuri, Son of Meelan Das Manikpuri, aged about 25 (presently 47) years, Assistant Teacher – Government Primary School – South Bilha, Tah. Bilha, Distt. Bilaspur (CG), resident of Kududan, Distt. Bilaspur (CG)

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

1. The State of Chhattisgarh, through : the Secretary, Department of Education, D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur (CG)

2. The Director, Lok Shikshan Sanchalnalay, D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur (CG)

3. The District Education Officer, Education Distt. Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh)

4. The State of Madhya Pradesh through : the Secretary, Department of Education, Vallabh Bhawan, Bhopal (Madhya Pradesh).

P.R. No. 1192/05
Presented by Shri R. Tiwari
dated 18-03-05

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLES 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

XI-HC-22

25

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक W.P. 1387/05 **सन्** **200**

..... **विरुद्ध** .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश

11.4.2005

Shri A.N. Bhakta, counsel for the petitioner.

Shri Akhil Agrawal, Panel Lawyer for the State.

Heard.

The case of the petitioner is that in the year 1979 the Education Department of erstwhile State of M.P. conducted a test for the appointment of ad-hoc Assistant Teachers in the Government Primary Schools. In that test the petitioner was selected and accordingly, he was appointed for a period of three months on a fixed salary of Rs.300/- per month. However, the services of the petitioner were discontinued and vacancy which arises on account of the discontinuation of the petitioner's services was filled by the State of M.P. Thereafter, the petitioner is regularly making representations for considering the petitioner to the appointment on the post of teacher. Further case of the petitioner is that in the year 1997 the erstwhile State of M.P. took a decision to appoint the ad-hoc teachers in place of Shiksha Karmi but same is not being implemented by the State of Chhattisgarh.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner may be allowed to make a representation to respondent No.2 raising all his grievances and respondent No.2 be directed to decide his representation, to which learned counsel for the respondent has no objection.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner is allowed to make a representation within a period of ten days from

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

26

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक ..... सन् 200

..... विरुद्ध .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश

today to respondent No.2 raising all his grievances and in turn respondent No.2 is directed to decide the representation of the petitioner within another three months from the date of receipt of the representation after considering all the grievances raised by the petitioner in accordance with law.

With the direction aforesaid, the petition stands disposed of.

Consequently, M.(W.)P. No.1076/05 & I.A. No.2631/05 & 2632/05 also stand disposed of.

Certified copy as per rules.

Sd/-
L.C. Bhadoo
Judge